

Remarks

In response to action items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15:

Applicant believes that rejections based on the Hayes reference “(Figs. 13-22; showing one or more display regions; such as a content of resource is displayed on the left panel)” are improper, as the left panel in fact shows a hierarchical tree of resources, no content.

Even allowing that “*the left panel*” may have been a typographic error, still there is nothing else of relevance to the pending claims to be found in Figs. 13-22. Please note that Hayes Figs. 15-24 show group and user management. There is no resource at all in Figs. 15-16, 18-23. There is a list of resources in Figs. 17 and 24, with no content of any resource shown. Fig. 14 is a window to enter a file name. Fig. 13 shows “*Attributes of the application that is selected in 1306 are shown at 1308.*” Such attributes of an application definitely are not the present invention’s or its claims’ “*normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the resource ... wherein the resource is a digital document*” as defined in the specification.

In response to action item 5:

The claims have been amended to be directed to statutory subject matter.

In response to action item 7, regarding claim 1:

MPEP §2111.01.IV. (Rev. 6, Sept. 2007) states: “*An applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer and may rebut the presumption that claim terms are to be given their ordinary and customary meaning by clearly setting forth a definition of the term that is different from its ordinary and customary meaning(s).*”

The application as filed 2004-03-17 in its specification explicitly defines the term “transformation” and other terms, without any implied admission that its definition is necessarily different from ordinary meaning, but rather to narrow its meaning among the multiple known meanings of the term. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition, as published in Microsoft Bookshelf 1996-97 for the noun “transformation” has multiple definitions 1. a., 1. b., 2., 3. a., 3. b., 4. a., 4. b. and 5, of which in 3. Mathematics definition 3. b. itself could be seen as two definitions: “*A mapping of one space onto another or onto itself.*”

The specification starting page 20 after referring to Figures 10 to 23 then from line 21 on defines: “As used in connection with the present invention, the term “transformation” is to be understood in the following context: If there is a set of users Joe, Bob and Dan, then references to them might be stored in an array, e.g. [Joe, Bob, Dan]. The index of Joe would be 0, of Bob would be 1, of Dan would be 2. In the display region some representation would be shown for each user. The coordinates x,y might be for Joe 5,25, for Bob 105,25 and for Dan 205,25. This represents one simple transformation.

Transformations may not only include numeric transformations, but also can include e.g. lookup of an image in a database, using a string user id as key, and subsequent image manipulation, i.e. transformation from string “Joe” to a cropped bitmap of his photo ID.

One example simple algorithm to determine the coordinates to display each user could first sort, e.g. by static information such as name, employee id or by dynamic information such as most recent access to a document, then position first user in upper left corner, subsequent users to the right of previous user, optionally using constant space per user or as much space as needed to display variable size items such as name, and if positioning to the right causes overflow to the right then wrap around to start another row below.

Transformation is from one mathematical or otherwise theoretical space into another. Many different algorithms may be used within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.”

Further, specification page 13 line 26 to page 14 line 3 defines: “As used herein, “structured data” may be taken as follows: If there is a set of users Joe, Bob and Dan, then most people in the field of information processing can easily agree that they would recognize a variety of representations in memory or on a storage medium as data: A properly delimited sequence of characters, an array of references to name strings, a collection of objects, etc.”

Further, specification page 20 lines 15-17 explains: “There are, however, important concepts being shown: How different display regions can show different transformations applied to the structured data which defines the access control settings for a resource...”

Action item 7, in quoting, has cut short the express limitation. The full text of the limitation is “one or more display regions for graphical representations of all access control settings for the resource, which result from transformations **applied to the structured data which defines the access control settings for the resource;**”.

To address claim rejection reasoning “*This is unclear as to whether one or more display regions, or all access control settings, or the resource result(s) from transformations.*” applicant replies:

“The resource” being singular it cannot be subject of “which result”, as a singular subject would require a different form of the verb, specifically “the resource, which results”. The specification defines and with examples describes transformations to be from structured data of access control settings into graphical representations of access control settings. The specification further shows that different display regions each show a different graphical representation of access control settings, wherein each different graphical representation results from a different transformation applied to the data which defines the access control settings.

Consequently, it is clear that the result of a transformation is a graphical representation, which is shown in a display region.

The present Reply, without implied admission of necessity, but rather to ease correct interpretation, asks to amend the limitation as “*one or more display regions for graphical representations of all access control settings for the resource, wherein the graphical representations result from transformations applied to the structured data which defines the access control settings for the resource,*”.

In response to action item 9, regarding claim 1:

There is more than one way for someone familiar with the present invention to ascertain that Hayes doesn’t anticipate the present invention.

Action item 9 analysis of claim 1, however, still shows apparent lack of understanding of Hayes and of its lack of relevance to the present invention.

Please note that Hayes Figs. 15-24 show group and user management. There is no resource at all in Figs. 15-16, 18-23. There is a list of resources in Figs. 17 and 24, with no content of any resource shown. In Figs. 17 and 24 for several resources a column “Permission” shows “permit” or “deny”, which isn’t a representation of *all access control settings* for the resource, but which is only a representation of access control settings for the resource for the group or user which is selected in the tree on the left. For one selected resource, again applicable only for the group or user which is selected in the tree on the left, buttons are available “Permit group access” 1730 and “Deny group access” 1732

or “Permit user access” 2430 and “Deny user access” 2432 respectively. Fig. 13 shows no access control setting.

Easily recognizable from the point of view of an operator trying to work on a digital document:

Hayes doesn’t show *all access control settings* for a resource.

Hayes doesn’t have *access control settings and content of the resource concurrently visible*.

Hayes doesn’t show *content of a digital document*.

Hayes only shows attributes 1308 of an application. An application is executable code, which in the art is considered distinct from a document, which is non-executable data.

Not only in detailed per feature analysis does Hayes fail to anticipate the present invention, but Hayes also fails to anticipate the present invention if seen from an operator’s point of view:

Hayes “*provides the capability of allowing an administrator to configure a user application.*”

Much more than that, the present invention enables a common user, not only an administrator, to review and adjust access control settings of a document the user is working with, concurrently to viewing or editing the document.

In response to action item 9, regarding claims 5, 36 and 38:

Action item 9 analyses of claims 5, 36 and 38 refer to use of an icon in Hayes. Hayes use of an icon, however, is for representing an applet, which is far from anticipating use of photo IDs for representing users.

In response to action items 10 and 14:

To explain lack of anticipation or obviousness in view of Steinberg, Remarks from 2008-10-16

“Steinberg concerns itself with image correction to correct camera variations. Central to Steinberg is taking a picture with a camera of a test sheet and from then on knowing what that specific camera’s variation is. All pictures coming from that camera from then on will be corrected by compensating for that specific camera’s variation, essentially by shifting image values into the opposite direction of the camera’s “deficiency” in order to get closer to the true colors of objects.

In contrast, the present invention tries to make all pictures the same, like a lawn of equally tall, equally green grass. The present invention doesn’t want to know about camera properties. All id photographs

are supposed to be made more equal.” can be illustrated with a simplified example, whereby the scale used for the example is of lesser or no importance for the argument:

Steinberg teaches if a camera once has been determined to need a correction of brightness +20 then all images from that camera will be adjusted brightness +20.

In contrast, the present invention teaches if the preferred brightness is 50 then an image of brightness 40 will be adjusted brightness +10, while an image of brightness 65 will be adjusted -15.

Steinberg explains “*The invention provides color corrected digital profiling methods that can correct for differences between reference colors according to a color chart and the reference colors as recorded and submitted as an image recorded by a photographic device or a film medium.*”

In response to action item 11:

As explained in response to action item 9, Hayes doesn’t teach the graphical user interfaces of claims 8 or 38.

In response to action item 12, regarding claim 10:

Hildebrand Fig. 2C.1 isn’t a graphical user interface, but it is a technical illustration of a data structure, described in para. 102.

Hildebrand Fig. 5B.1 doesn’t show users privileges for a single, specific document. Para. 135 explains Fig. 5B.1 shows privileges *for any secured documents*, and it mentions *levels for various active folders, storage locations, users or group of users*. There is no hint at user interface for a single document.

Sekiguchi doesn’t teach user interface, but Sekiguchi figures illustrate the workings of an automated “*security monitoring apparatus*”.

Sekiguchi Figs. 3-5 are logs, while Figs. 7-8 are “*access restriction information*” and Fig. 10 is “*security management information*”. Fig. 9 is called a “*log*”, but really it is a single event record (*col. 9, lines 56-67 to col. 20, lines 1-15*).

Sekiguchi doesn’t show access log information compiled for a single, specific document.

Sekiguchi (*col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*) fails to show claim limitations “*indication whether the most recent write access by the user to the resource is the most recent write access by any user to*

the resource;” “indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the resource has been before the most recent write access by any user to the resource;” and “indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the resource has been since the most recent write access by any user to the resource; ...”

Hildebrand repeatedly mentions how a system administrator can configure access control.

In contrast, the present invention teaches how to enable a non-technical professional can review, comprehend and correctly modify access control settings.

The present invention addresses an apparent contemporary lack of user interface for access control that can be used efficiently by non-technical professionals. Some areas of IT apparently haven’t succeeded yet at getting “their UI right”, access control being one of them. To express it colloquially, “security folks don’t do UI” and “UI folks don’t make a dent in access control”. Applicant’s extensive past research has indicated professional users and companies want and have business needs for usability of access control and hence resulting effective protection through access control. Apparently someone, i.e. applicant, first had to spell out “how to do it”.

Having been in conversations about improving UI for access control, applicant must reject the notion of supposed obviousness of “getting it right”. Delivering ease of use for non-technical professionals apparently isn’t in the bag of offerings of the security software industry. And if it shows up on the horizon, it is labeled as a “problem that should be solved.”

In response to action item 12, regarding claim 12:

Hildebrand doesn’t teach a display region for a “*normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the resource*” ... wherein the resource is a digital document.

Hayes Figs. 15-24 show group and user management. There is no resource at all in Figs. 15-16, 18-23. There is a list of resources in Figs. 17 and 24, with no content of any resource shown. Fig. 14 is a window to enter a file name. Fig. 13 shows “*Attributes of the application that is selected in 1306 are shown at 1308.*” Such attributes of an application are not the present invention’s or its claims’ “*normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the resource ... wherein the resource is a digital document*” and definitely not with terms as defined in the specification.

In response to action item 13, regarding claim 33:

Hildebrand doesn't in paras. 0108 and 0135 or elsewhere describe macros as defined and further explained with examples in the specification of the present invention, nor anything named macros nor any concept like macros.

Hildebrand describes groups.

In response to action item 13, regarding claim 34:

Action item 13 analysis of claim 34 refers to use of an icon in Hayes. Hayes use of an icon, however, is for representing an applet, which is far from anticipating use of photo IDs for representing users.

In response to action item 15, regarding point (a):

Hayes in the left panel in fact shows a hierarchical tree of resources, no content.

In response to action item 15, regarding point (b):

Hayes (*col. 21, lines 5-8*) describes *"The administrator can also launch an applet in the context of colleend by clicking the "Run/Customize" button 2434. When this is done, the applet selected in list 2420 is launched in the right panel."* That description lacks clarity whether the applet replaces list 2420 and buttons 2430 and 2432 or is placed together with them. Looking at equivalent (*col. 19, approx. lines 33-40*) description *"Furthermore, regardless of an applet's permission status for the selected context, an administrator can select an applet from 1720 and click the "Run/Customize" button 1734 to execute the user applet under the selected context. The panel region previously showing the notebook for the current context then becomes occupied by the executing user applet."* considering the equivalence between Fig. 17 for a group and Fig. 24 for a user, and understanding Hayes's use of the term *"notebook"*, it becomes clear that the applet and the *"Applet List"* with *"Permission"* column and *"Permit..."* and *"Deny..."* buttons do not concurrently show.

Even if one were to assume Fig. 24 were different than Fig. 17, an assumption for which no supporting evidence has been found, Hayes fails to concurrently show all access control settings for an applet. Hayes' user interface is organized for one user or for one group to show all applets and to permit or deny access, but Hayes' user interface is not organized for one applet to show all users or all groups together with their access privileges, let alone allowing their manipulation within such visual organization.

Even if one were to assume Fig. 24 were different than Fig. 17, an assumption for which no supporting evidence has been found, Hayes' applets are programs, executable code, not documents. Per Wikipedia, retrieved 2009-03-17: "*An applet is a software component that runs in the context of another program, for example a web browser. An applet usually performs a very narrow function that has no independent use. Hence, it is an application -let.*" and "*The word applet could alternatively be used to describe a small standalone application, such as those typically bundled with operating systems, for example a calculator program or text editor.*"

In response to action item 15, regarding point (c):

Hayes doesn't show for a single resource the list of users permitted to access the resource. The membership in such list would be a consequence of what users and groups have been permitted to access the resource combined with group memberships.

In response to action item 15, regarding point (d):

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition, as published in Microsoft Bookshelf 1996-97 for the indefinite article "a" as first definition lists: "*Used before nouns and noun phrases that denote a single but unspecified person or thing: a region; a person.*"

The feature upon which applicant relies "user interface showing information for one document only" is recited in claim 10 through use of the singular of "a resource" in "a graphical user interface for representing access log information and access control settings for a resource" and subsequent consistent references to "the resource".

In response to action item 15, regarding point (e):

In claims 28 and 31 reciting "a user interface wherein graphical representations of users are sorted" sorting is the essence of these claims. Showing sorted information isn't a use, but it is a means to achieve better operator performance.

In some business workflows, for best performance, operators must see listed first who still has read or write privileges, who has written most recently (i.e. who has worked recently), or who has read most recently (i.e. who is up-to-date). That is the use. To allow that use, showing sorted information is the means.

The bodies of these claims depend on these recitations.

In response to action item 15, regarding point (f):

“An integrated graphical user interface” effects the display of access control settings and access log information to open together with the display of document settings, to move together, and to close together. It is the essence of the present invention and of the claims that operators do not have to perform substantial mental or physical operations to work with the content of documents together with access control settings and access log information. By reducing operator effort, the present invention reduces the probability that operators will fail to use the access controls available to them. To enable lower effort, “an integrated graphical user interface” is provided.

In claim 1 reciting “normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of a document in the same UI as access control” is part of the essence of that claim. In claim 12 reciting “normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of a document in the same UI as access control” is the essence of that claim. That “representations of the access control settings and the display region for representation of the content of the resource are concurrently visible, are concurrently operable, and appear to the operator as in an integrated graphical user interface” isn’t a use, but it is a means to achieve better operator performance.

The bodies of these claims would not be complete without these recitations. They would describe a different set of systems.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully solicits prompt consideration of his arguments herein, and allowance of all claims pending.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leo Baschy/

Leo Baschy

Applicant Pro Se

Date 2009-03-18